



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Seven inscriptions have some bearing on our knowledge of the Rex Nemorensis. None of these can be said to tell us anything about him, but they refer to the cult of which he was hierophant, or to its temple. They are C. I. L. 3.1773; Orelli, 1453-1457, 2212. The genuineness of more than one of Orelli's sheaf is suspected.

Some 20 passages in 16 authors concern the Rex or the cult of the temple:

Cato (quoted by Priscian, Peter's *Historicorum Romanorum Fragmenta*, page 52); Dionysius 6.32; Festus, s. v. Manius; Gratius Faliscus 483-492; Hyginus, *Fabulae* 261; Martial 12.67; Ovid, *Ars Amatoria* 259-260, *Fasti* 3.263-272, 6.756; Pausanias 2.27; Servius on Vergil, *Aeneid* 2.116, 6.136, 7.515; Silius Italicus, *Punica* 4.366; Solinus 2.11; Statius, *Silvae* 3.1.52-60; Strabo 5.3.12; Suetonius, *Caligula* 35; Valerius Flaccus, *Argonautica* 2.305; Vitruvius 4.8.4.

In the scanty literature referred to above many more references will be found, but they concern Aricia or Diana or Hippolytus or Virbius, not the Rex.

Of the 20 references given above six are important: Cato; Gratius Faliscus; Ovid, *Fasti* 3.263-272; Pausanias; Servius on Vergil, *Aeneid* 6.136; Strabo.

UNIVERSITY SCHOOL FOR BOYS,  
Baltimore.

EDWARD L. WHITE.

## REVIEWS

The Greek Theater and its Drama. By Roy C. Flickinger. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press (1918). Pp. xxviii + 358. 80 Illustrations. \$3.00.

This book deserves the highest commendation. It is one of the most scholarly books in recent years on a classical subject. Professor Flickinger has devoted nearly twenty years to researches connected with the Greek drama. Even as a graduate student he published (1902) an article on The Meaning of *ἐπι τῆς σκηνῆς* in *Writers of the Fourth Century* (Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago 6.13-26), and, later, a very important dissertation (1904) on Plutarch as a Source of Information on the Greek Theater (University of Chicago Press). For the last ten years there has not been a single year in which one or more important articles on the drama did not appear from his pen. I emphasize this to show that the present volume, which embodies these papers in revised form, though two-thirds of the book are new, represents the work of nearly a score of years. The book ought to appeal to all general as well as technical students of the drama, especially as it is written in a readable style and contains many medieval and modern parallels and quotations from many modern dramatic critics. It is a good sign that real works of scholarship can be produced in America even in war times.

The book is neither literary nor strictly archaeological. There are already many books and articles on the literary criticism of the Greek drama and there remains to be written a satisfactory book giving all the archaeological material bearing on the Greek drama. Pro-

fessor Flickinger's volume rather deals with dramatic technique and with the technical background and environment of the Greek drama. It lays special stress on the peculiarities and conventions and the technical aspect of the Greek drama, showing how the Greeks overcame and put to good use the physical limitations. After a long introduction, of 117 pages, intended primarily for the Greek student, dealing with the origin of tragedy and comedy and the Greek theater, come chapters on The Influence of Religious Origin (119-132), The Influence of Choral Origin (133-161), The Influence of Actors (162-195), The Influence of Festival Arrangements (196-220), The Influence of Physical Conditions (221-245), The Influence of Physical Conditions (Continued): The Unities (246-267), The Influence of National Customs and Ideas (269-283), and the Influence of Theatrical Machinery and Dramatic Conventions (284-317). Chapter IX (318-337) deals with Theatrical Records. The index of passages will enable anyone reading a particular play to turn to the pages where passages in that play are discussed, and the general index will be useful. The illustrations are in general excellent<sup>1</sup>, though the archaeologist naturally wishes more variety and misses many important theaters and theatrical scenes.

In a review it would not be possible to discuss all the much-mooted questions taken up in this volume.

<sup>1</sup>The very crude and inaccurate sketch map in Fig. 2 (where for example Attica is labelled "Attic" and the island of Elaphonisos is drawn as part of the Malea peninsula of Laconia) and the primitive plan of the Acropolis in Fig. 29 are exceptions. Some of the illustrations would have been improved if taken from better and more up-to-date sources. So Fig. 73 should have been reproduced, not from the antiquated drawing in Baumeister, but from Furtwängler-Reichhold, *Griechische Vasenmalerei*, Pl. 90, to which work (Pl. 48) credit should be given for the *Duris psykter* reproduced in Fig. 10 from Höber, who of course took it from that source. Fig. 4, which shows, on a Naples crater, preparations for a Satyric drama, is likewise taken from Baumeister; nothing is said about Von Salis's excellent article on it, in the *Jahrbuch* 25 (1910), 126 f. For the British Museum clyx by Brygus (31) also refer to Furtwängler-Reichhold, Pl. 47, rather than to Baumeister. For the theater at Priene (Figs. 63, 64, and 113, 115) there should be a reference to the official publication on Priene by Wiegand and Schrader, 235-257, and Pls. XVI-XVIII. The worst illustration is the last, (333), an antiquated and inaccurate drawing of the statue of Euripides in the Louvre, with an alphabetical list of his plays, taken from Clarac. It gives an entirely inadequate idea of the original portrait of Euripides, and the inscriptions are wrong. *Ἀλκυστις* (this is given by Professor Flickinger [332] with an E for H) and *Μελέαγρος*, are complete. There are traces of the title of another play after *Ἐπιείρος*, and the name Euripides does not occur on the stone (compare Giraudon photograph 1515, or Alinari photograph, or Lippold, *Griechische Porträtstatuen*, 49, Fig. 5).

There are abundant bibliographical references throughout, and the latest and most significant works are cited. Unfortunately, two important articles in the *Jahrbuch* 32 (1917), 1-15 and 15-104, *Zum Ursprung von Satyrspiel und Tragödie*, by Frickenhaus, and *Die Herkunft des Tragischen Kostüms*, by Miss Rieber, were probably not accessible in time. That of Solmsen, on *Σιληνός σάτυρος, τίτυρος*, in *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 30 (1912), 449 ff., as well as Kuhnert's article on Satyros and Silenos, in Roscher's *Lexicon*, and Bulle's *Die Silene* should have been cited and used in the discussion about satyrs. To the bibliography on the origin of tragedy (1) might be added Tieche, *Der Ursprung der Tragödie* (Aarau, 1915); Wilamowitz's introduction to his translation of Euripides's *Cyclops*, and his *Aischylos Interpretationen* (1914), 2 and 240 ff.; Levi, *Rivista di Storia Antica* 12 (1908), 201; Nilsson, *Die Dionysischen Feste der Athener*, *Jahrbuch* 31 (1916), 323; D. C. Stuart, *The Origin of Greek Tragedy in the Light of Dramatic Technique*, *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 47 (1916), 173-204; and perhaps also articles in some of the dictionaries, such as Navarre's article on *Tragoedia*, in *Daremberg et Saglio*. On the dramatic art of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Menander, the articles of Professor Post in *Harvard Studies* 16 (1905), 15 ff., 23 (1912), 71-127, 24 (1913), 111 ff. might have been mentioned, though perhaps Professor Flickinger did not think them important enough.

Suffice it to mention only a few points. Articles on the origin and development of the Greek drama will continue to be written so long as there is any interest in Greek; and until archaeology finds some conclusive evidence, the matter will be debated. Professor Flickinger discusses very sanely the ancient passages dealing with the origin of tragedy and comedy, especially those in Aristotle's Poetics, in which he rightly puts more trust than is put by Ridgeway and other modern writers, who transgress good philological practice in tracing tragedy back to ritual rites. He believes that tragedy did develop from the dithyramb and follows the traditional view that it was associated with the worship of Dionysus. He derives the name tragedy from the fact that the goat was the prize and was perhaps sacrificed by the winner. This seems very probable and was an ancient tradition, though certainly not earlier than the third century B. C., and the passage cited from the Parian Chronicle is a restoration, even if a very probable restoration. There is, however, also a distinct tradition that tripods were given as prizes (often on vases; compare *Archäologische Zeitung* 38 [1880], 182 f., Pl. 16; Graef, *Die Antiken Vasen von der Akropolis*, No. 654 A, Pl. 41). Frickenhaus, however, thinks that tragedy means goat-song and was named after the leader of the chorus of equine satyrs, who later themselves became goats like their leader, Silenus, who was originally a goat and who is so addressed in Sophocles's *Trackers*. In my article on the Greek drama in Hastings's Dictionary of Religion and Ethics, I favored Ridgeway's idea that tragedy was the song of goat-men, and I am still inclined to think that something can be said for the theory that the goat-satyr had something to do with the word tragedy, which first occurs in the time of Aristophanes, long after the time of the earliest vase with goat-satyrs (Fig. 9, about 450 B. C.). Representations of men in goat-skins or human goats occur even on Minoan seals, and men dressed as *tragoi* to impersonate a goat Dionysus may have performed in Dorian tragedy, whence the word may have been transferred to Attica, where the satyrs were of the Silenus type with human feet and may have been called *tragoi*. The *Etymologicum Magnum*, as well as a fragment of Aeschylus and a passage in Sophocles's *Trackers*, certainly refers to satyrs as goats. It would seem strange to name so important a branch of literature as tragedy after the goat as prize or sacrifice, and the analogy of such words as *κωμῳδία*, *τραγωδία*, *αὐλῳδία* is against that interpretation of *τραγωδία*.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup>The discussion (24 f.) of representations in art of Sileni and Satyrs is not entirely satisfactory. Only seven vases, namely those that are inscribed, are mentioned as representing ithyphallic Sileni, including the François vase, which is wrongly called (24) an amphora, instead of a crater. But there are many others even showing Sileni with horses' hoofs, though uninscribed in the earlier black-figured ware (see for example, Sieveking, *Die Königliche Vasensammlung zu München*, Nos. 844, 868, 869, 894); but of Sileni or Satyrs with human feet there are countless examples on black-figured vases which date long before the red-figured vases of Duris and Brygos cited on page 31. Also in sculpture they exist, as for example in the *poros* gable of the old Dionysus temple, which dates before 500 B. C. (*Athenische Mittheilungen*, 11 [1886], Pl. 11).

Professor Flickinger believes that the usual view that tragedy developed out of the dithyramb through satyr-drama is incorrect and that tragedy and the satyr-drama are separate developments from the dithyramb, a theory which explains away many inconsistencies in the usual view but which still lacks definite proof. It is a pleasure to see that an English book on the theater at last accepts the idea that the Greek actors acted in the orchestra. Here we have the first detailed sympathetic presentation in English of Dörpfeld's views. Professor Flickinger's views with regard to the *proskēnion* and *paraskēnion* may have to be changed in view of the important work of Professor J. T. Allen, who will soon publish a monograph on the Greek theater of the fifth century (cf. J. T. Allen, *Key to the Reconstruction of the Fifth Century Theatre at Athens*, in *University of California Publications in Classical Philology* 5. [1918], 55-58).

Professor Flickinger does not agree with Dörpfeld's idea that the Neronian stage belonged to the high Graeco-Roman type, but thinks, as Dörpfeld originally argued, that it was about four feet nine and a half inches high and that stone steps led from the orchestra to the center of the stage, as in the Phaedrus theater. But the frieze of the Phaedrus stage has the heads knocked off almost all the figures and the Neronian stage from which it came originally must have been much more than six inches higher. I am sure that Dörpfeld believes, as Professor Flickinger does, that the Nero stage did not project so far into the orchestra as the Phaedrus stage, even if he has not indicated it. At any rate that was his belief when I last heard him lecture in 1909.

The statement is made (86, 111) that Priene affords the sole instance of a Graeco-Roman hypocaustum having columns, but in many other cases there are columns and a proscenium in Greek theaters still used

The Würzburg cylix, with the inscription which is interpreted as a mistake for *σάτυρος*, though it might be some peculiar barbarian proper name, *Σάτυρως*, is wrongly said to be the earliest representation of a satyr in Attica (compare, for example, for similar figures, unscripted, on earlier black-figured vases Nicole, *Catalogue des Vases Peints du Musée National d'Athènes*, No. 953, a black-figured pyxis with satyr and four goats; Graef, *Die Antiken Vasen von der Akropolis*, No. 654 A, Pl. 42; Pottier, *Louvre Album*, Pl. 63; Sieveking, op. cit., Nos. 840, 841, 878, 881, 898, 924, and many others). I am very suspicious of this inscription, and Professor Flickinger bases too much on this one doubtful case. If the Würzburg figure with human feet is a satyr, it confirms my belief that such figures which occur so frequently even on black-figured vases of the sixth century were known as satyrs. Even the red-figured cylix which I published in the *American Journal of Archaeology* 21 (1917), 159 f. (to which no reference is made) and which I interpreted as a reminiscence of a satyr play has a satyr which, as that in the pediment of the Old Dionysus temple, is much nearer to the original ithyphallic satyr (compare Solmsen's etymology of satyr, l. c.) than any of Professor Flickinger's examples and is nearly as old as, if not older than, the Würzburg cylix, which might date later than 500 B. C. I am not sure that Fig. 9 (30), dated about 450 B. C., represents goat-satyrs. As Reisch (cited by Professor Flickinger also) has suggested, they may be Pans in some such comedy as Eupolis's *Alēyes*; Pan is represented with goat hoofs on vases as early as 500 B. C., a mode of representation that surely influenced such scenes as that in Fig. 9. As regards the five Attic vases (Figs. 12-16) which depict comus revelers, they are far different in style, some black-figured, others red-figured, and cannot all date about 500 B. C. (38). Fig. 13 might date as early as 550 B. C., though of course some black-figured vases continued to be made after the introduction of the red-figured style about 530 B. C. Some of the red-figured ones might be even later than 486 B. C.

or remodeled in Roman times, as at Assos, Thera (Athenische Mittheilungen 29.57 f.), etc. Compare especially Miletus, where the Doric columns in front are, in the lower smooth part, of red marble, in the upper channeled part, of black marble, and have white capitals (compare plan in *Archäologische Anzeiger* 21 [1906], 35). On page 88, in the discussion of the light the extant plays throw on the stage question, the writings of Professors Capps and White are cited, but the Munich prize thesis of Professor Pickard, which was published one year later, seems always to be overlooked in such bibliographies (compare an English version, *The Relative Position of Actors and Chorus in the Greek Theatre of the Fifth Century*, in *American Journal of Philology* 14 [1893], 68 f., 273 f.). On page 90, in the analysis of Aristophanes's *Frogs*, it is said that Dionysus and Charon direct their boat across the orchestra to where, in the center of the front row of seats, the priest of Dionysus and other functionaries always sat, but the stone chair in Fig. 45, to which reference is made, belongs to the time of Lycurgus, and it should be stated in the note on page 90 that the inscription is of the first century B. C. Otherwise the general reader will think that Aristophanes could have seen this chair of the priest of Dionysus and the inscription. It is stated (268) that the victors in the Olympian games received a palm branch, but the palm as a symbol of victory was unknown at Olympia (compare Tarbell, *Classical Philology* 3 [1908], 264 f.).

I wish there were space to discuss many other things in this excellent book. For example, Professor Flickinger does not agree with Professor Rees's dissertation, and thinks that the technique of almost every tragedy is explicable only on the assumption that the regular actors were restricted to three. He believes that there were two types of *eccyclema*, a butterfly valve, to the base of which a semicircular platform was attached, and a low, trundle platform. He believes in the use of masks, but is too suspicious of the cothurnus, and does not commit himself. About costumes too he says little.

Professor Flickinger has produced a new kind of book on the Greek drama and has done so remarkably well that we hope he will continue with his specialty and produce a much needed up-to-date book on scenic antiquities, an American Haigh. We should like also a completer account than is given in Chapter IX of the *Theatrical Records*, with the Delian and the Delphian choric inscriptions, and all other inscriptions throwing light on the drama, such as, for example, the inscription telling how the Dionysus chorus of Euripides's *Bacchae* was sung in the Delphi stadium in later times, and many others, most of which are published by Wilhelm or in the *Inscriptiones Graecae* (I. G.), etc., to which Professor Flickinger everywhere wrongly refers as *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*, the designation of the old Boeckh *Corpus*.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY. DAVID M. ROBINSON.

Goethe's Estimate of the Greek and Latin Writers as Revealed by his Works, Letters, Diaries, and Conversations. By William Jacob Keller, Instructor in German in the University of Wisconsin. A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, at the University of Wisconsin (1914). *Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin*, No. 786, May, 1916. Pp. 191. 40 cents.

It is the aim of the writer of this monograph "to present in a manner convenient for reference and in an entirely objective way, all of Goethe's more important spoken and written utterances"<sup>1</sup> on Greek and Latin literature. The work has been called forth by the fact that scholars everywhere are recognizing more and more the value of Goethe's literary judgments and "are quoting his words as the final, or at least as a very weighty authority on matters of literature"<sup>1</sup>.

The most obvious feature in this summary of Goethe's utterances is the amazing extent of his acquaintance with Greek and Latin writers, including not merely the universally acknowledged masters but, literally, scores of others, representing all periods in both literatures. He felt no prejudice against a writer who did not belong to the classical period, "da im dritten Jahrhundert so gut ein Genie geboren werden konnte wie im ersten"<sup>2</sup>.

But it must be admitted that in ranging over so vast a field the poet made copious use of translations. As a boy he had studied Greek somewhat. He read the New Testament with ease, for his father required that parts of it be "recited, translated and explained on Sundays after church"<sup>3</sup>. That his knowledge of the language must, however, have been limited appears from a statement which he made<sup>4</sup> at the age of twenty-one to the effect that he now reads Homer almost without a translation. Eighteen years later he writes<sup>5</sup> to Carl August that he is hopeful about the progress of his zealous study of Greek, but he seems never to have regarded himself as having attained a real command of the language. Latin he knew better, though he confessed the weakness of his grammatical knowledge, having learned Latin as he learned German, French and English, "nur aus dem Gebrauch, ohne Regel und ohne Begriff"<sup>6</sup>.

The most attractive chapter in this thesis is naturally that on Epic Poetry, for Homer is the author who interests Goethe most continuously in the course of a long life. From his twenty-first year there are few years in which Goethe does not speak more or less often of his Homeric studies. Sometimes he is reading Homer every day; the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are the delight of his youth and the refuge of his old age. Their truth to nature is the quality which he is forever praising.

Interesting is the impression made upon him by the first reading of Wolf's newly published *Prolegomena*. In a letter to Schiller, May 17, 1795, he writes<sup>7</sup>:

<sup>1</sup>So Mr. Keller, page 5.  
<sup>2</sup>Goethe's *Werke* (Weimar edition) III.3.244. The references to Goethe's writings made below are all to this edition.  
<sup>3</sup>Keller, 8. <sup>4</sup>IV.1.258. <sup>5</sup>IV.9.161. <sup>6</sup>I.27.40. <sup>7</sup>IV.10.260.